

BEFORE THE  
POLLUTION CONTROL HEARINGS BOARD  
STATE OF WASHINGTON

IN THE MATTER OF  
SCARSELLA BROTHERS, INC.,

Appellant,

v.

PUGET SOUND AIR POLLUTION  
CONTROL AGENCY,

Respondent.

PCHB Nos. 82-125, 82-126  
82-127, 82-128 & 82-129

FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT,  
CONCLUSIONS OF LAW & ORDER

This matter, the appeal from the issuance of five \$250 civil penalties for the alleged violations of Sections 8.02(3), 8.02(5), and 8.05(1) of Regulation I, came before the Pollution Control Hearings Board, Gayle Rothrock, Chairman, and Larry Faulk (presiding), at a formal hearing on February 9, 1983, in Lacey.

Appellant was represented by its attorney John D. Blankenship; respondent was represented by its attorney, Keith D. McGoffin. The proceedings were electronically recorded.

Having heard the testimony, having examined the exhibits, and

1 having considered the contentions of the parties, the Board makes the

2 FINDINGS OF FACT

3 I

4 Appellant, Scarsella Brothers, Inc., is a general contractor  
5 operating in the State of Washington.

6 II

7 On July 6, 1982, appellant obtained a valid burn permit from the  
8 City of Tacoma Fire Department. The permit gave Scarsella Brothers,  
9 Inc., (hereinafter Scarsella) permission to burn material at the  
10 Tacoma Industrial Airport, which Tacoma owns. This material was  
11 obtained from brush, trees and torn down buildings resulting from  
12 construction of highway overpasses at Sixth and Pearl Streets in the  
13 City of Tacoma. The burn permit, re-issued on July 6, 1982, was a  
14 copy of a previous permit issued by the City of Tacoma Fire  
15 Department. It did not have printed on the reverse side, which are  
16 normally on such a permit, a list of the general requirements for safe  
17 controlled open burning. The conditions listed on the front side of  
18 the permit limited the size of the burn pile(s); established the  
19 location of the burn pile, and established the necessary fire control  
20 measures.

21 III

22 On July 7, 1982, respondent's inspector was drawn to the Tacoma  
23 Industrial Airport by a telephone call from a firefighter for Pierce  
24 County Fire Protection District #5 in Gig Harbor, Washington.

25 The respondent's inspector proceeded to the Tacoma Industrial  
26 Airport and observed four piles of burning material. Three of the

1 piles contained natural vegetation such as stumps and branches and a  
2 fourth pile contained various types of material from the A&W Root Beer  
3 building, gas station and fruit stand previously located at Sixth and  
4 Pearl in the City of Tacoma.

5 IV

6 Respondent's inspector talked to the bulldozer operator for  
7 Scarsella at the site. The operator showed him a copy of a burn  
8 permit issued by the City of Tacoma Fire Department. Respondent's  
9 inspector then contacted Pierce County Fire Protection District #5,  
10 assistant chief Allen Stenback and was informed that the burn site  
11 (Tacoma Industrial Airport) is within the jurisdiction of Fire  
12 District #5 and that no permits or authorization to conduct such a  
burn had been issued by District #5.

14 Respondent's inspector then contacted Deputy Fire Marshal, Ron  
15 Larkin of the City of Tacoma Fire Department, who informed him that a  
16 burn permit was obtained by Don Scarsella of Scarsella Brothers, Inc.  
17 The inspector was not able to determine from Chief Larkin if the City  
18 of Tacoma Fire Department had jurisdiction of the burn site.

19 Respondent's inspector then spoke to Frank Scarsella of Scarsella  
20 Brothers, Inc., and informed him of the notices of violation.  
21 Mr. Scarsella indicated he was not aware that the respondent agency  
22 needed to be contacted once a fire department burn permit was  
23 obtained. The inspector explained Sections 8.02(3), 8.02(4), 8.02(5)  
24 and 8.05(1) of Regulation I to Mr. Scarsella.

V

On July 9, 1982, respondent's inspector mailed five notices of violation Nos. 18876, 18877, 18878, 18879 and 18880. From these notices followed, on August 30, 1982, five civil penalties of \$250 each for the alleged violations.

Civil penalty No. 5605 is for alleged violation of Sections 8.02(5) and 8.05(1) of Regulation I; No. 5606 for 8.02(5) and 8.05(1); No. 5607 for 8.02(5) and 8.05(1); No. 5608 for 8.02(3), 8.02(4), and 8.02(5) and No. 5609 for 8.05(1).

From these notices of violations and civil penalties appellant has appealed to this Board.

VI

Neither respondent nor Pierce County Fire Protection District No. 5 issued a written permit or approval of the fires in question. The Tacoma City Fire Department did issue a permit for the fires in question.

VII

Pursuant to RCW 43.21B.260, respondent has filed with this Board a certified copy of its Regulation I and amendments thereto which are noticed.

Section 8.02(3) makes it unlawful for any person to cause or allow an outdoor fire containing certain materials, including asphalt, paints and plastics.

Section 8.02(4) prohibits an outdoor fire for purpose of demolition of materials.

FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT,  
CONCLUSIONS OF LAW & ORDER  
PCHB NOS. 82-125, -126,  
-127, -128 & -129

1 Section 8.02(5) makes it unlawful for any person to cause or allow  
2 any outdoor fire in violation of any applicable law, rule or  
3 regulation of any governmental agency having jurisdiction over such a  
4 fire.

5 Section 8.05(1) makes it unlawful to conduct an outdoor fire other  
6 than for land clearing, burning, or residential burning, unless  
7 written approval has been issued by respondent.

8 Section 3.29 provides for a penalty of up to \$250 per day for each  
9 violation of Regulation I.

10 VIII

11 Appellant was fined for one previous violation of Regulation I.

12 X

13 An exhibit at the hearing, a September 27, 1982 letter from  
14 Assistant Chief Stenback of Pierce County Fire Protection District #5  
15 to Mr. W. D. DeHaan of the Puget Sound Air Pollution Control Agency  
16 quotes Deputy Chief Larkin as saying, "The entire property of the  
17 Tacoma Narrows Airport is under the direct control of the City of  
18 Tacoma Fire Department for the purposes of fire prevention, fire  
19 suppression and control, and burning regulations, including burn  
20 permits."

21 XI

22 Appellant testified that Scarsella Brothers were under the  
23 impression that the burn permit obtained from the Tacoma City Fire  
24 Department gave them permission to burn at the Tacoma Industrial  
25 Airport.

26 FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT,  
27 CONCLUSIONS OF LAW & ORDER  
PCHB NOS. 82-125, -126,  
-127, -128 & -129

XII

Any Conclusion of Law which should be deemed a Finding of Fact is hereby adopted as such.

From these Findings the Board comes to these

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

I

Outdoor fires to dispose of natural vegetation and construction debris did occur at the Tacoma Industrial Airport on July 7, 1982, without the express approval of the respondent.

II

Appellant's assertion that he had permission to burn is supported by the fact that he; 1) did receive a valid burn permit from the City of Tacoma. The facts also show that the City of Tacoma does, in fact own and have jurisdiction over the Tacoma Industrial Airport. No evidence was presented to indicate the City gave over responsibility for fire prevention and control to Pierce County Fire District #5.

III

The Board, however, believes that the City of Tacoma should have alerted Mr. Scarsella that he also needed the approval of the Puget Sound Air Pollution Control Agency. The City of Tacoma should also have notified Pierce County Fire Protection District #5 that they had given permission for the subject fires. The City additionally should only issue permits which are legal under Regulation I and the Clean Air Act.

FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT,  
CONCLUSIONS OF LAW & ORDER  
PCHB NOS. 82-125, -126,  
-127, -128 & -129

IV

Prohibited materials most likely were burned and therefore a technical violation of Section 8.02(3) occurred.

V

Appellant did not violate Sections 8.02(4), 8.02(5), and 8.05(1) as alleged.

VI

Any Finding of Fact which should be deemed a Conclusion of Law is hereby adopted as such.

From these Conclusions the Board enters this


ORDER


The four \$250 civil penalties (totaling \$1000) assessed on Scarsella Brothers, Inc., and the City of Tacoma are vacated for appellant, Scarsella Brothers, Inc.

The \$250 civil penalty for the technical violation of 8.02(3) is suspended.

DONE this 3<sup>rd</sup> day of March, 1983.

POLLUTION CONTROL HEARINGS BOARD

  
LAWRENCE J. FADLK, Member

  
GAYLE ROTHROCK, Chairman